

**DISTRIBUTIVE LEADERSHIP PRACTICES AND  
CHALLENGES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF  
HADIYAZONE, IN SOUTHERN NATIONS NATIONALITIES  
AND PEOPLES REGIONAL STATE**

**MISGANA TEKLE ANSHEB\***

---

**Abstract**

This study aimed at investigating distributive leadership practices and challenges in secondary Schools of Hadiya Zone. Descriptive survey research design with both quantitative approach and qualitative approach were concurrently employed in the study. Data was collected from teachers, principals, vice principals and department heads of eight secondary schools of Hadiya Zone. A proportional sampling technique followed with simple random sampling technique (lottery method) was used to get information from respondents. Thus, from general of 550 teachers, 25 principal and vice principals and 168 department only 247(33.2%) respondents participated in this study.. A closed ended questionnaire in the form of a 5-point Likert scale was used to collect the data. The data were analyzed using descriptive (mean and standard deviation and independent T- test. Open ended responses were analyzed qualitatively. Thus, the major findings of the study shows as the principals lose strong support from teachers and it spends much of time on administrative issues rather than academic issues. The study result also reveals as principals lack knowledge on how to participate teachers in leading school and distribute tasks among teachers to engage t on leadership role were among the major challenges what principals faced in practicing distributive leadership in school. The T-test result also found  $p < 0.05$  i.e. there is strongly statistically significant difference between the mean of the two groups ( teachers and school leaders) which means the teachers do not share the same perception as the school leaders

---

\* **MITIKU BEKELE (PhD) & DEREJE DAKSA**

implemented the distributive leadership practices in their schools; guided and supported than the school leaders. It is recommended that, Woreda and Zone education offices in collaboration with Southern Nations Nationalities Peoples Regional Bureau provide and facilitate professional development trainings by focusing on distributed leadership. The collaborative nature of interdisciplinary teams, as well as the trust and relationships necessary to engage in effective teaming also seem what the principals to practice..

**Key words: Distributive leadership, Practices and Challenges and Secondary Schools**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1. Background of the Study**

Leadership is a complex phenomenon that exists in any organization where there is a need of inspiring and influencing members of a given organization. Gronn (2002) defined leadership as a process whereby an individual influences a group of individuals to achieve a common goal in the organization. However, in the context of a model in which leadership is shared across an organization or school, the definition of leadership takes on a more diffuse nature.

Distributive leadership has become a popular 'post-heroic' representation of leadership which has encouraged a shift in focus from the attributes and behaviors' of individual 'leaders' as promoted within traditional trait, situational style and transformational theories of leadership to a more systemic perspective, whereby 'leader- ship' is conceived of as a collective social process emerging through the interactions of multiple actors (Bolden, 2011). From this perspective, it is argued: Distributive leadership is not something 'done' by an individual 'to' or a set of individual actions through which people contribute to a group or organization. It is a group activity that works through and within relationships, rather than individual action.

In a knowledge-intensive enterprise like teaching and learning, there is no way to perform these complex tasks without distributing the leadership responsibility in the organization because distributed leadership becomes the glue of a common task or goal, improvement of instruction, and a common frame of values for how to approach that task (Elmore, 2000).Goleman (2002) argued for a distributive perspective on leadership that goes beyond the superiority of the leader

and the dependency of the followers. Gronn (2000) emphasized that leadership is better understood as 'fluid and emergent, rather than a fixed phenomenon. The role of the principal becomes more critical than ever in a shared leadership school community.

A primary goal of a principal committed to collective work as the key to student growth across the school will be to develop the leadership capacity of everyone in the school. Lambert (1998) says: Viewing leadership as a collective learning process leads to the recognition that the dispositions, knowledge, and skills of capacity building are the same as those of leadership. In this way, leadership becomes clearly separated from headship.

Effective leaders play their role by creating prevailing vision and mission , communicating the vision and mission, clarifying mission and organizational objectives to all levels of the organizations, and steer organizations to high performing outcomes (Duressa & Author, 2014). What makes a good leader and different forms of leadership as well as where leadership should be located for maximum performance (Trottieretal, 2008).

Daresh ( 1998) and Sammons( 1995), describe that School leadership is the extent to which school principals provide climate, opportunity, capacity building resources and also provide support to teachers, parents and students to function at their best both academically and socially. Leadership at all levels of the education system is now being recognized as a viable approach in meeting the critical need of bringing quality education and improving student achievement. Studies on school leadership and student achievement have highlighted the evidence of school leadership behaviors which contribute to student achievement.

School leadership is critical to quality education and to create a situation in which best teaching and learning can occur (Sergiovanni, 2001).School leadership is ability to inspiring teachers and others to pursue your vision within the parameters you set, to the extent that it becomes a shared effort, a shared vision, and a shared success. It also is a process of social influence, which maximizes the efforts of others, towards the achievement of a goal (Camburn, 2003).

In contrast to traditional schools of leadership, which pay attention to an individual managing hierarchical structure, other researchers have generated evidence that the school principal does not have a monopoly on school leadership (Mujis, 2005). All stake holders; principals, vice principals, unit leaders, department heads, teachers, students and community also play important role (Smylie and Denny, 1990). Styles of leadership that encourage leaders to share responsibilities and authority have been the subject of much recent interest.

Management of Education is a collaborative and cooperative activity. Teachers, students, parents and other stakeholders with whom school works possess untapped potential in all areas of human endeavor (Sergiovanni, 2001). Thus, the active involvement of these groups in the management of the school has paramount importance for students' achievement.

Therefore, it is unwise to think that principal is the only one providing leadership for school performances and student achievement. In Ethiopia, since the implementation of the 1994 Education and training policy (ETP), the management of educational institutions is decentralized. In order to implement properly the decentralized process various trainings were provided to Kebele education and training board, school director and PTAs of schools (MoE, 2005). Since then, promising achievements have been gained in access and equity of education, but quality of education is still suffering. To improve quality of education various initiatives have been introduced such as school improvement programs, teacher development programs, curriculum and civic and ethical education. One of the domains of school improvement program is school leadership. To make educational leadership effective, it should ensure the involvements of all the stakeholders: teachers, parents, community and students (MoE, 1999). In this regard, various trainings have been given to principals, department heads and teachers at zonal, Woreda and school level.

## **1.2. Statement of the Problems**

School leadership now a day's becomes a top priority in Ethiopia education policy (MOE, 1994). Because it plays a key role to make teaching and learning more effective and also to improve efficiency and quality of education. In addition, also provide support to teachers, parents, and students to function at their best both academically and socially. Effective

leadership is generally accepted as being a key to school success. Traditionally, schools have been large, impersonal systems with decision making centralized at the highest levels.

Harris (2005) and others have contended that the foundation in a distributed conceptual framework lies in the relationship between leaders, followers, and the situation. The components of distributed leadership are diversified, that are distributed in schools by principals namely: distributed leadership as setting direction; developing people; redesigning the organization, business and people management and; managing instructional program.

Today, with collaborative leadership, teachers are being asked to engage as leaders. Distributive leadership stresses the importance of leadership that is distributed and performed by several people including the formal leader. Firestone & Diamond, (2001) points out that teacher leadership is becoming increasingly present and that it can contribute to improving school health and performance

The school principal is considered to be a person in the leadership position most responsible and accountable for school success and failure; however, trying to achieve quality education and improve student achievement without making teachers to play leadership roles is a futile exercise. Regarding this, Macbeth (1998) and Day et al (2000) (cited in Mulford, 2003) state that one of the most congruent findings from studies of effective leadership in schools is that authority to lead need not be located on a single person but can be dispersed within the schools between and among people.

Moreover, Sergiovani (2001) stated that the more that leadership practices are cultivated in a school, the more likely it is that everyone get chance to use their talents fully and the commitment of everyone is likely to be. This clearly shows us that, the school principals should strive to involve multiple individuals in order to bring school improvement and quality education.

Day et al.(2007) concluded that substantial leadership distribution was very important to a school's success in improving pupil out comes' where by distributed leadership was positively correlated to the conditions which in turn impacted positively up on student behavior and

students learning outcomes. As compared with exclusively hierarchical forms of leadership, distributed leadership more accurately reflects the division of labor experienced daily in organizations and reduces the chances of error arising from decisions based on the limited information available to a single leader. Distributive leadership also enhances opportunities for the organization to benefit from the capacities of more of its members, permits members to capitalize on the range of their individual strengths, and develops among organizational members a fuller appreciation of interdependence and how one's behavior affects the organization as a whole (Leadwood, 2004). To make educational leadership effective, it should ensure the involvements of all the stakeholders: teachers, parents, community and students (MoE, 1999).

Teachers' participation in school leadership depends heavily on principals' interaction and collaboration. Principals are in the first order position to block, to support and facilitate, and to shape the nature and function of teacher leadership in their schools. It is also indicated in the background of the study that teachers at all levels in schools have leadership responsibilities as part of their everyday duties. These responsibilities are not carried out in isolation but involve working with and through principals and colleagues.

Today's principals can neither achieve nor sustain improvements in student learning by acting in isolation (Elmore, 1999). Distributive leadership is purported to cause great effects on "teacher leaders themselves, as they gain leadership skills, improving instructional practices, and become more fully engaged in their work" (Lashway, 2003). Therefore, teacher leadership increases teacher professionalism and improves the organizational vigor and atmosphere in schools (Murphy, 2005). The National Association of Secondary School Principals (2006) insists that the principal should provide leadership by building and maintaining a vision, direction, and focus for student learning but also argues that the principal of a school should never act alone. The principal must facilitate development of a shared strategic vision for the school, formulating goals and planning change efforts with staff, and setting priorities for one's school in the context of community and district priorities and student and staff needs through a collaborated approach.

However, there are discrepancies between what literature suggests and what is actually observed in secondary schools under study. As a researcher's know-how and observation from different

meetings and timely reports of Woreda Education Office, Zone Education Department and Regional Education Bureau there is low participation of teachers in the area of school leadership. The school principals were seen trying to cover all the school leadership activities alone rather than involving teachers. Teachers also consider classroom teaching as their sole responsibility. Moreover, although many studies were conducted on principals' instructional leadership practices, no study was undertaken locally regarding principals' distributive leadership practices so far. Therefore to fill this gap the study was intended to assess the principals' distributive leadership practices and challenges as perceived by teachers and school leaders in secondary schools of Hadiya zone, in Southern Nations Nationalities Peoples Regional state by raising the following basic questions.

1. To what extent teachers are willing to participate in leadership role in their schools?
2. To what extent do principals of secondary schools exercise distributive leadership practices in school setting?
3. What major factors hinder principals to exercise distributive leadership practices?
4. Is there any perception difference among teachers and school leaders about distributive leadership practices?

### **Objectives of the study**

The study aimed to assess the principals' distributive leadership practices and challenges in secondary schools of Hadiya zone, in southern nation's nationalities people's regional state.

### **Specific Objectives**

In line with achieving the general objective, the specific objectives pursued are:

- 1) To identify the willingness of teachers in school leadership
- 2) To assess the extent principals of secondary schools exercise distributive leadership practices in school setting
- 3) To identify major factors that hinder principals' practice of distributive leadership practices
- 4) To identify the mean difference among teachers and school leaders about principals distributive leadership practices

### **The scope of the study**

The study is delimited to eight (8) government secondary schools in the zone and in the content wise it's delimited to the five core leadership functions that are distributed in schools by principals, namely setting direction; developing people; redesigning the organization, business and people management and; managing instructional program.

### **Definition of key Terms**

Distributive Leadership: is decision-making and influential practices performed by personnel at multiple levels in an organization instead of individual leaders at the top of an organizational hierarchy

Teacher leadership: is the process by which teachers, individually or collectively, influence their colleagues, principals, and other members of the school communities to improve teaching and learning practices with the aim of increased student learning and achievement.

Leadership Behavior: process or activities of an individual or group in efforts toward achieving goals in a given situation.

Principal: Principal in this study refers to the director of secondary schools

## **3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

### **3.1. Research Method**

The method employed in this research was both quantitative and qualitative methods more emphasizes on quantitative one. Concurrent approach, in which the researcher converged quantitative and qualitative data in order to provide comprehensive analysis of the research problem, was used.

### **3.2. Sources of the Data**

To answer the basic questions of the research, relevant data were collected from primary sources. Primary sources of data were school leaders and teachers of the schools under study as they are directly or indirectly involved in school leadership activities.

### 3.3. Target population

The target populations of the study were 1305 teachers in 26 secondary schools, 26 principals, 78 vice principals, 220 Department heads of Hadiya zone, in Southern Nation's, Nationalities and People's Regional State.

#### Sample size and sampling Techniques

Hadiya Zone was selected purposively by the researcher for its accessibility among the 14 Zones of Southern Nation Nationalities Peoples Regional state. From total of 26 secondary schools in zone, 8(31%) namely Homecho, Megacho, Mesmes, Yekatit , Wachemo , Gimbicho, Shurmo and Wasgabata Secondary secondary schools were selected as a sample using lottery method of random sampling techniques.

The sample size of the representative population has been computed using the formula display as follows:

$$n = \frac{NZ + (Se)^2 \times (1-p)}{NSe + Z^2 \times P(1-P)}$$

$$NSe + Z^2 \times P(1-P)$$

Where; **n** = sample size **N**= total number of population (550) **Z**= the standard value (2.58) of 1% level of probability with 0.99 reliability **Se**= Sampling error or degree of accuracy (0.01) **p**= the population proportion (it is assumed to be 0.5 since this would provide the maximum sample size).

To determine of equal proportion of sample teachers from each secondary school William, (1977) proportional technique formula has been utilized.

Then simple random sampling technique (lottery method) was used to select (138) teachers, 84 department heads, 25 principals and vice principals.

Table 1. The summary of the population, sample size and sampling technique

No	Name of Secondary School	Principals	Sample	Vice principals	Sample	Department Heads	Sample	Total Teachers	Sample size proportion	Sample	Total population	Total Sample
1.	Homacho	1	1	2	2	20	10	58	$\frac{58}{550} \times 138$	15	81	27

2.	Megacho	1	1	2	2	20	10	48	$\frac{48}{550} \times 138$	12	71	24
3.	Mesmes	1	1	2	2	20	10	67	$\frac{68}{550} \times 138$	17	90	30
4.	Shurmo	1	1	2	2	20	10	56	$\frac{56}{550} \times 138$	14	79	26
5.	Wachemo	1	1	2	2	21	10	70	$\frac{70}{550} \times 138$	18	94	31
6.	Gimbicho	1	1	2	2	24	12	81	$\frac{80}{550} \times 138$	20	108	35
7.	Yekatit 25/67	1	1	3	3	24	12	120	$\frac{120}{550} \times 138$	30	147	50
8.	Wasgabata	1	1	2	2	20	10	50	$\frac{50}{550} \times 138$	12	73	24
	Total	8	8	17	17	168	84	550	$\frac{550}{550} \times 138$	138	743	247
	%	100%	100%	100%	50%	50%	25%			33.2%		
<b>Sampling techniques</b>		All(census method)	All(census method)	Simple random(lottery method)								

### 3.4. Data collection Instruments

In this study to acquire the necessary information from participants, questionnaire and document analysis were used to collect data from selected secondary schools of Hadiya zone.

### 3.5. Methods of Data Analysis

The data were analyzed by descriptive statistics (percentage, mean & standard deviation) and inferential statistics (Independent t-test) depending on the nature

## 4. PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF DATA

Table 2. Distributive leadership practices in setting direction

Items	Group Statistics			
	Types respondent	N	M	SD
1. The principal builds consensus around common set of values among teachers	Teachers	138	2.81	.932
	schools leaders	109	2.82	.890
2. The principal clarifies and makes known the school's rule and to all school members.	teachers	138	2.82	.895
	schools leaders	109	2.77	1.059
3. The principal discusses instructional related policies and issues with staff regularly.	teachers	138	2.62	1.209
	schools leaders	109	2.20	1.095
4. The Principal participates all staff while developing the strategic plan of the school.	Teachers	138	2.44	1.267
	schools leaders	109	2.28	1.046
5. The principal discusses the school academic goal with all staff regularly.	teachers	138	2.52	1.2511
	schools leaders	109	2.56	1.02
6. The principal involves teachers while developing vision, mission, goals and values of the school.	teachers	138	2.73	1.286
	schools leaders	109	2.56	1.039
7. The principal makes teachers to participate in most significant issues of the school.	teachers	138	2.38	1.135
	schools leaders	109	2.29	1.124
Overall Average		247	2.56	1.089

Note: N=Frequency, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation. Mean value (M)  $\geq 1.00-2.50$  = very low,  $2.51-2.99$  = low,  $3.00-3.50$  = medium,  $3.51-3.99$  = high,  $\geq 4.00$  = very high practices and very low and low considered as low level of agreement practices whereas high and very high considered as high on practices.

As depicted in table 6, regarding distributed leadership practices in setting direction among the seven items, the teachers and the school leaders rated in all items with the lowest of scored with overall average 2.56 (1.089) respectively and the items were include : the principal discusses instructional related policies and issues with staff regularly, the principal participates all staff while developing the strategic plan of the school, and the principal makes teachers to participate in most significant issues of the school mission, goals and value of the school; and if the principals make teachers to participate in the development of the strategic plan of the school.

It is also stated in the literature that, a vision developed in isolation is less likely to influence followers because they have no part or stake in a vision that is entrusted to them (Newman & Simmons, 2000).

Table 3. Principals' distributive leadership practices in developing people

	Types respondent	N	M	SD
1. The principal encourages teachers to assume certain responsibilities	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.52 2.43	1.250 1.321
2. The principal supports teachers on their individualized plan of professional development	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.47 2.37	1.351 1.296
3. The principal encourages teachers to attend professional development activities which directly enhance their teaching	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.52 2.46	1.291 1.229
4. The principal makes teachers experiment and take risks, even when there is risk of failure.	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.47 2.65	1.203 1.091
5. The principal challenges teachers to try out new and innovative ways to do their work.	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.80 2.70	1.002 1.141
6. The principal plans and facilitates the provision of in-service training programs for teachers	Teacher schools leaders	138 109	2.70 2.71	0.874 0.794
7. The principal encourages teachers the opportunities to learn from one another.	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.70 2.60	1.161 1.114
8. The principal provides teachers the opportunities to chair meetings	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.74 2.88	1.067 0.868
9. The principal initiates teachers to conduct peer observation	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.57 2.75	1.106 0.934
10. The principal gives teachers a great deal of freedom and choice in deciding how to do their work	Teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.82 2.86	1.038 0.876
<b>Overall average</b>		247	2.63	1.000

Note: N=Frequency, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation. Mean value (M)  $\geq 1.00-2.50$ = very low,  $2.51-2.99$  = low,  $3.00-3.50$  = medium,  $3.51-3.99$  = high,  $\geq 4.00$  = very high practices and very

low and low considered as low level of agreement practices whereas high and very high considered as high practices

As depicted in table 7, in all the ten items under this category, both respondents were agreed at low regarding distributed leadership practices in developing people with the mean and standard deviation ranging from 2.37(1.296) to 2.88(0.868) that their distributive leadership practices in developing people is low or unsatisfactory. This contradicts with (Sheped, 1996) stated, when teachers capacities and motivations are positively enhanced through leadership of others in the organization, they develop professionally and promote the development of others.

Table 4. Principals' distributive leadership practices in redesigning the organization

Types respondent	Types respondent	N	M	SD
1. Foster and maintain atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within the school setting.	Teachers	138	2.73	0.924
	schools leaders	109	2.77	0.946
2. Facilitate good and smooth communication among teachers and all school members	Teachers	138	2.89	0.994
	schools leaders	109	2.75	1.001
3. Initiate individuals or groups to make decisions on issues important for schools' success.	Teachers	138	2.78	1.044
	schools leaders	109	2.61	1.137
4. Encourage formal and informal groups to contribute to the achievement of schools' objectives.	Teachers	138	2.84	1.010
	schools leaders	109	2.87	0.933
5. Encourage staff to feel secure in taking risks to innovate best ideas that contribute to the school's development.	Teachers	138	2.78	1.021
	schools leaders	109	2.74	0.936
6. Create conducive environment in which a good working relationship exist	Teachers	138	2.73	1.050
	schools leaders	109	2.78	1.089
7. Foster and promote cooperation and cohesion among staff members	Teachers	138	2.78	0.926
	schools leaders	109	2.72	0.891
8. Establish supportive atmosphere in which teachers are encouraged to work as a team member	Teachers	138	2.69	0.924
	schools leaders	109	2.67	0.951
<b>overall average</b>		247	2.75	0.986

Note: N=Frequency, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation. Mean value (M)  $\geq 1.00-2.50$ = very low,  $2.51-2.99$  = low,  $3.00-3.50$  = medium,  $3.51-3.99$  = high,  $\geq 4.00$  = very high practices and very low and low considered as low level of agreement practices whereas high and very high considered as high on practices

As shown in Table 8, regarding distributed leadership practices in redesigning the organization, the respondents rated similarly low level in all of the items with the mean and standard deviation scores were ranging from 2.61(1.137) to 2.89(0.994). However, as it is stated by Whalstorm and Louis, (2003) an organization becomes redesigned in light of distributed leadership, teachers are given opportunities to be part of a group decision making because distributive leadership promotes the idea that teachers have influence over and practice in school-wide decisions. In addition to research by Harris and Muijs (2005) also found distributed leadership results in widely shared decision-making process viewed as the responsibilities of group rather than the individual.

**Table 5. Principals' distributive leadership practices in Business and People Management**

Items	Types respondent	N	M	SD
1. Actively listens to teachers' diverse points of view	teachers	138	2.62	0.960
	schools leaders	109	2.65	0.975
2. Treat all staff equally	teachers	138	2.68	1.003
	schools leaders	109	2.61	0.922
3. Encourage teachers to take part in the planning and implementation of staff performance appraisal	teachers	138	2.77	0.959
	schools leaders	109	2.77	0.929
4. Accept teachers' feedback	teachers	138	2.81	1.007
	schools leaders	109	2.74	0.832
5. Involve teachers in planning and implementation of the school's budget	teachers	138	2.55	1.018
	schools leaders	109	2.69	0.907
6. Involve teachers in schools income generating activities	teachers	138	2.77	1.120
	schools leaders	109	2.78	1.089
7. Develop and maintain high morale in teachers.	teachers	138	2.77	0.928
	schools leaders	109	2.66	0.871
8. Recognize teachers as colleagues and respect them	teachers	138	2.86	0.945
	schools leaders	109	2.66	0.882
<b>Overall average</b>		247	2.71	0.114

Note: N=Frequency, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation. Mean value (M)  $\geq 1.00-2.50$ = very low,  $2.51-2.99$  = low,  $3.00-3.50$  = medium,  $3.51-3.99$  = high,  $\geq 4.00$  = very high practices and very low and low considered as low level of agreement practices whereas high and very high considered as high on practices

As depicted in Table 9, concerning the principals' distributive leadership practices in business and people management, as the mean values in the table indicate, the teachers and school leaders were replied in all items with low level ranging from the mean and standard deviations 2.55(1.018) to 2.86 (0.945) respectively in all of the items in the same table. Generally, one can conclude that, Principals' distributed leadership practices in business and people management was below expectation with overall average 2.71(0.114).

**Table 6. Principals' distributive leadership practices in managing instructional Programs**

	Types respondent	N	M	SD
1. The principal discusses new ideas about teaching and learning with teachers at a staff meeting regularly	teachers	138	2.75	0.949
	schools leaders	109	2.68	0.929
2. The principal encourages teachers in the selection and implementation of appropriate teaching techniques and materials	teachers	138	2.78	0.933
	schools leaders	109	2.59	0.914
3. The principal involves teachers in identifying students with disciplinary problems and providing proper guidance	teachers	138	2.81	0.983
	schools leaders	109	2.75	0.963
4. The principal discuss the progress and implementation of teaching and learning activities in staff meeting regularly	teachers	138	2.88	0.982
	schools leaders	109	2.54	0.966
5. The principal makes teachers to play role in setting grades and student assessment techniques.	teachers	138	2.84	0.968
	schools leaders	109	2.61	0.932
6. The principal opportunities are provided to discuss new classroom practices with colleagues	teachers	138	2.73	0.985
	schools leaders	109	2.51	0.987
7. The principal makes and encourage teachers to participate in planning and implementation of co-curricular activities.	teachers	138	2.89	2.480
	schools leaders	109	2.73	0.812
8. The principal makes teachers' active role in the evaluation of text books and syllabus.	teachers	138	2.80	0.957
	schools leaders	109	2.77	0.842

9. The principal encourage teachers to teachers	138	2.67	0.967	
undertake action research	schools leaders	109	2.74	0.864
10. The principal involve teachers in solving teachers	138	2.68	0.926	
students learning problems.	schools leaders	109	2.71	0.882
Overall Average		247	2.72	0.271

Note: N=Frequency, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation. Mean value (M)  $\geq 1.00-2.50$ = very low, 2.51-2.99 = low, 3.00-3.50 = medium, 3.51-3.99 = high,  $\geq 4.00$  = very high practices and very low and low considered as low level of agreement practices whereas high and very high considered as high on practices

As it shown in Table 10, regarding the principals' distributive leadership practices in managing instructional program in selected schools. The respondents rated similarity at low level with the mean and standard deviation scores ranging from 2.54(0.966) 2.89(2.480) for all of the items. Thus, it can be possible to conclude from these findings that the school leaders and the teachers perceived the principals distributed leadership practices in terms managing instructional program is low and unsatisfactory with overall average mean and standard deviation 2.72(0.271) So, managing the instructional program in the distributive leadership frame work requires teacher leaders to play a role in improving the quality of education by being leaders beyond the class room. Teachers' involvement in the selection of instructional materials, appropriate teaching techniques and student assessment methods has a paramount importance for students' academic achievement (Rost, 1993).

Table7. Major Factors that hinder principals to exercise distributive leadership practices

Items	Types respondent	N	M	SD
1. Instability of principals assignment in their positions	teachers	138	3.65	1.097
	schools leaders	109	4.08	0.640
2. Teachers' lack of interest to participate in school leadership	teachers	138	3.42	1.189
	schools leaders	109	3.86	1.150
3. Teachers' unwillingness to assume leadership role	teachers	138	2.33	0.865
	schools leaders	109	2.61	0.999
4. Principals' spend much of their time on administrative and political issues rather than	teachers	138	3.71	1.054
	schools leaders	109	3.59	1.202

exercising leadership role					
5.	Lack of trust between teachers and principals	teachers	138	2.70	0.899
		schools leaders	109	2.35	0.687
6.	Principals feel that exercising leadership is the responsibility of principals not the responsibility of teachers.	teachers	138	3.22	0.989
		schools leaders	109	3.22	0.909
7.	Principals' lack of knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers.	teachers	138	3.39	0.858
		schools leaders	109	3.41	0.973
8.	Principals lack the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction.	teachers	138	3.43	0.895
		schools leaders	109	3.16	0.918
9.	Absence of commitment among principals in participating teachers in school leadership.	teachers	138	3.30	0.884
		schools leaders	109	3.17	1.044
10.	Principals feel that, sharing their leadership role is risky.	teachers	138	3.36	0.836
		schools leaders	109	3.24	1.072
11.	Principals lack knowledge on how to make teachers to play leadership role.	teachers	138	3.50	0.794
		schools leaders	109	3.18	0.851
12.	Absence of support from teachers.	teachers	138	3.34	0.999
		schools leaders	109	3.23	1.008
Overall Average			247	3.26	1.140

Note: N=Frequency, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation. Mean value (M)  $\geq 1.00-2.50$ = strongly disagree,  $2.51-2.99$  = disagree,  $3.00-3.50$  = neutral,  $3.51-3.99$  = agree,  $\geq 4.00$  = strongly agree practices and very low and low considered as low level of agreement practices whereas high and very high considered as high on practices

As stated in Table 11, on item 1, school leaders, and teachers responded instability of principals' assignment in their position hinders those principals from exercising distributive leadership practices with mean and standard  $3.6(1.07)$ ,  $4.08(0.64)$  respectively, school leaders, and teachers revealed that, this is the major factor for hindering the principals to exercise distributive leadership practices in their respective schools. However, on item 3 both respondents agreed low level of teachers' unwillingness to assume leadership role with mean and standard

devtion  $2.33(0.865)$  &  $2.61(0.999)$  respectively as hindering factors in exercising distributive leadership practices.

All the remaining items both respondents were agreed as major Factors that hinder principals to exercise distributive leadership practices. Generally, major factors that hinder principals to

exercise distributive leadership practices in secondary schools were slightly high with overall average 3.26(1.140)

**Table 8. Results of independent variables for each of the independent samples t-test**

\*p<0.05

As indicated in table12, the mean value for each of the independent variables has been greater for teachers as compared to the schools leaders. The mean score of the teachers on the all

	Respondent s	N	M	SD	t	df	sig	Mean Difference
1. Distributive leadership practices in Setting Direction	teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.62 2.50	.850 .858	1.10	231.0	.000	.121
2. Distributive leadership practices in developing people	teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.64 2.63	.880 0786	-.08	218.5	.000	-.009
3. Distributive leadership practices redesigning the organization	teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.78 2.74	.732 .864	.36	211.5	.000	.037
4. Distributive leadership practices in Business and People Management	teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.73 2.70	.699 .804	.33	215.1	.000	.032
5. Distributive leadership practices in terms of managing instructional programs	teachers schools leaders	138 109	2.78 2.66	.717 .771	1.23	223.6	.000	.118
6. Factors hinders Distributive leadership practices	teachers schools leaders	138 109	3.28 3.26	.503 .408	.33	244.7	.000	.019

independent variables of mean and standard deviations 2.62(0.850), 2.63(.786), 2.78(0.732), 2.73(.699),2.78(.717),&3.28(.503) respectively are statistically significantly higher2.50( 0.858), 2.63(0.786),2.74(.864),2.70(.804), 2.66(0.771 ),&3.26(.408) than those of schools leaders on the same variables. Besides, t-test was computed to look for any statistically significant difference

for each of the independent variables between the two groups of respondents t-test results found ( $t = 1.10, -.08, .36, .33, 1.23, .33$ ;  $df = 231.0, 218.5, 211.5, 215.1, 223.6 \& 244.7$  and  $p = 0.000$ ), respectively  $p < 0.05$  i.e. there is statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups, i.e. the teachers do not share the same perception as the school leaders implementation of the distributed leadership practices guided and supported and typically the teachers are more generous than the school leaders.

Table 9. Model summary

<b>Model Summary</b>										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change in R Square	F Change	df1	df2	Sig.	Durbin-Watson
1	.842 <sup>a</sup>	.810	.778	.40598	.550	23.857	12	234	.000	1.383

a. Predictors: (Constant), Absence of support from teachers, Principals feel that exercising leadership is the responsibility of principals not the responsibility of teachers., Lack of trust between teachers and principals, Teachers' lack of interest to participate in school leadership, Teachers' unwillingness to assume leadership role, Principals lack the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction., Instability of principals assignment in their positions, Principals lack knowledge on how to make teachers to play leadership role., Principals' lack of knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers., Principals' spend much of their time on administrative and political issues rather than exercising leadership role, Absence of commitment among principals in participating teachers in school leadership., Principals feel that, sharing their leadership role is risky.

b. Dependent Variable: distributive leadership

As shown in table 13, result from the Model Summary shows that there is strong relationship between factors hinders and distributive leadership, R is 0.810 and 81% of variation in distributive leadership are explained by absence of support from teachers., principals feel that exercising leadership is the responsibility of principals not the responsibility of teachers., lack of

trust between teachers and principals, teachers' lack of interest to participate in school leadership, teachers' unwillingness to assume leadership role, principals lack the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction, instability of principals assignment in their positions, principals lack knowledge on how to make teachers to play leadership role., principals' lack of knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers., principals' spend much of their time on administrative and political issues rather than exercising leadership role, absence of commitment among principals in participating teachers in school leadership, principals feel that, sharing their leadership role is risky.

Adjusted R Square for this model is 0.778, which means that the independent variable can explain about 77.8% of the change in dependent variable i.e. only 22.2% of the variation : distributive leadership cannot be explained by absence of support from teachers., principals feel that exercising leadership is the responsibility of principals not the responsibility of teachers., lack of trust between teachers and principals, teachers' lack of interest to participate in school leadership, teachers' unwillingness to assume leadership role, principals lack the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction., instability of principals assignment in their positions, principals lack knowledge on how to make teachers to play leadership role., principals' lack of knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers., principals' spend much of their time on administrative and political issues rather than exercising leadership role, absence of commitment among principals in participating teachers in school leadership, principals feel that, sharing their leadership role is risky. Therefore, there must be other variables that have an influence also.

Table 14. The Prediction of independents factors hinders towards distributive leadership

<b>Coefficients</b>				
Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	
1 (Constant)	2.789	.215	12.96	.000

Instability of principals assignment in their positions	.034	.032	.055	1.067	.000
Teachers' lack of interest to participate in school leadership	.008	.025	.017	0.328	.000
Teachers' unwillingness to assume leadership role	.198	.033	.314	6.05	.000
Principals' spend much of their time on administrative and political issues rather than exercising leadership role	-.117	.032	-.222	-3.71	.000
Lack of trust between teachers and principals	.130	.033	.183	3.98	.000
Principals feel that exercising leadership is the responsibility of principals not the responsibility of teachers.	-.030	.037	-.048	-.79	.000
Principals' lack of knowledge on what kinds of tasks to be distributed to teachers.	-.070	.038	-.108	-1.84	.000
Principals lack the ability to influence teachers to follow the desired direction.	.004	.036	.007	.120	.000
Absence of commitment among principals in participating teachers in school leadership.	-.039	.037	-.064	-1.06	.000
Principals feel that, sharing their leadership role is risky.	-.136	.038	-.219	-3.55	.000
Principals lack knowledge on how to make teachers to play leadership role.	.018	.042	.025	.420	.000
Absence of support from teachers.	.086	.028	.146	3.03	.003

#### a. Dependent Variable: distributive leadership

As shown in table 14, provides details of the model parameters (the beta values) and the significance of these values. So, the value of b1 represents the gradient of the regression line. It was 2.78. Although this value is the slope of the regression line, it is more useful to think of this value as representing the change in the outcome associated with a unit change in the predictor.) Therefore, the betas are different from 0 and we can conclude that the independent variables make a significant contribution ( $p < 0.005$ ) to predicting distributive leadership. Notice that all of the significance levels are ( $p < 0.05$ ) so, all variables are statically significant.

Finally, the standardized beta ( $\beta$ ) results shown among the 12 variables, the largest influence on factors hinders toward distributive leadership is lack of trust between teachers and principals (0.183) and the next is absence of support from teachers (0.146). On the other hand Principals' spend much of their time on administrative and political issues rather than exercising leadership

role of the beta value -0.222 is the poorest predictor of distributive leadership when it is compared with the other explanatory variables under this study.

#### 4.1. Qualitative results from open ended questions

The main purpose was to narrate and triangulate the results of the open ended response with questionnaires results so as to drive conclusions and recommendations in relation to the basic research questions of the study.

Responses of Principals, Department head and Teachers to the open ended questions were as follows:

- For questions that were asked to the principals and the department heads to list what hinder them in exercising distributive leadership practices, the following responses were secured and these include: lack of adequate and continuous leadership training, lack of time, work load, teachers' unwillingness to take responsibility, large staff to lead and etc.
- For questions that were asked the teachers to list principals distributive leadership hindering factors, the following responses were secured from the majority of the item and include: principals lack of confidence in exercising leadership, principals' lack of ability, lack of commitment among principals. Thus, although the principals; and the teachers and the department heads perceive distributive leadership hindering factors from different angle, it possible to infer from their responses that there are gaps in exercising, distributive leadership in school setting in secondary schools under study.

#### 4.2. Integration of Quantitative and Qualitative Data Analysis

This section addresses major points of qualitative and quantitative data results for integration is condensed as follows:

- To make educational leadership effective, it should ensure the involvements of all the stakeholders: teachers, parents, community and students (MoE, 1999).
- Distributed leadership also enhances opportunities for the schools to benefit from the capacities of more of its members, permits members to capitalize on the range of their individual strengths, and develops among organizational members a fuller appreciation of interdependence and how one's behavior effects the organization as a whole (Leadwood,2004). Principals can

neither achieve nor sustain improvements in student learning by acting in isolation (Elmore, 1999).

Contrary to the literature above, the results of quantitative and qualitative data showed that the practices in secondary schools principals do not involve teachers while developing vision, mission goals and values of the school system. Also staff participation and decision making on schools issues were very low due to weak collaboration among staff in the schools. The findings verified that these weak practices were caused by lack of awareness on basic idea of distributive leadership practices among staff, lack of leadership competency, weak monitoring and evaluation system, lack of commitment on the side of school principals, lack of technical support from district education and zone education officials. Thus, due to the above mentioned problems in secondary schools the data gathered from qualitative and quantitative data concurrently confirmed that the school principals were not practicing distributive leadership in their respective schools.

## MAJOR SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### **5.1. Major Summary of Findings**

Based on the analysis and interpretation of the data, the researcher has come up with the following major findings:

- School leaders and the teachers regarding to distributive leadership practices in terms of setting direction as rated as low, or not adequate in all of the items. this implies that, the principals' performances inadequate.
- The study also showed that, principals do not involve teachers while developing vision, mission goals and values of the school system.
- The teachers were also rated lowest on the principals in participating teachers in most significant issues of the schools.
- In redesigning the organization, the respondents rated similarly low level in all of the items with the mean and standard deviation scores were ranging from 2.61(1.137)to 2.89 (0.994).
- Principals' distributed leadership practices in business and people management was below expectation with overall average 2.71(0.114).
- In most of the items showing the principals' practice of distributing this core leadership function (managing instructional program), that the school leaders and the teachers perceived the

principals distributed leadership practices in terms managing instructional program is low and unsatisfactory with overall average mean and standard deviation 2.72(0.271)

➤ According to these respondents, principals' spending much of their time on administrative than academic issue; principals in ability how to make teachers to play leadership role, and principals' lack of knowledge on what kinds tasks to be distributed to teachers could be the major factors that hinders principals from exhibiting distributed leadership practices.

➤ School leaders, and teachers responded instability of principals' assignment in their position hinders those principals from exercising distributed leadership practices with mean and standard 3.6(1.07), 4.08 (0.64) respectively, school leaders, and teachers revealed that, this is the major factor for hindering the principals to exercise distributive leadership practices in their respective schools.

➤ Similarly, most of the school leaders, and teachers responded that principals' spending much of their time on administrative issue with mean and standard deviation 3.71(1.054) and 3.59(1.202) respectively hinders the distributive leadership practices in the schools.

➤ lack of adequate and continuous leadership training, lack of time, work load, teachers' unwillingness to take responsibility, large staff to lead, principals lack of confidence in exercising leadership, principals' lack of ability, lack of commitment among principals, lack of trust between teachers and principals, were the main hindering factors of principals distributive leadership practices.

➤ Finally, the major hindering factors of distributive leadership practice were mean value for each of the independent variables has been greater for teachers as compared to the schools leaders. The mean score of the teachers on the all independent variables of mean and standard deviations 2.62(0.850), 2.63(.786), 2.78(0.732), 2.73(.699), 2.78(0.717), & 3.28(.503), respectively are statistically significantly higher 2.50(0.858), 2.63(0.786), 2.74(.864), 2.70(.804), 2.66(0.771), & 3.26(.408) than those of schools leaders on the same variables.

➤ Besides, t-test was computed to look for any statistically significant difference for each of the independent variables between the two groups of respondents the t-test results found ( $t=1.10, .08, .36, .33, 1.23, .33; df=231.0, 218.5, 211.5, 215.1, 223.6, 244.7$  and  $p=0.000$ ), respectively  $p<0.05$  i.e. there is a statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups, i.e. the teachers do not share the same perception as the school leaders implementation of the

distributive leadership practices guided and supported and typically the teachers are more generous than the school leaders

## **5.2. Conclusions**

Based on the findings, the following conclusions were drawn:

The willingness of teachers to participate or involve in school leadership besides teaching students in classrooms was recognized to be positive. Teachers found to be confident and believe in their ability to help, motivate and support their colleagues. This confidence of teachers comes from the belief that teachers are close to students and to their colleagues and better placed than other leaders such as heads to make changes that benefit students learning. Evidence from studies suggests that distributing leadership through teachers can make substantial contribution to teaching and learning. In order to achieve this, teachers need to be involved and motivated by the leadership.

The study showed, however, the principals of the Secondary schools of the zone under study did not participate and encourage teachers to assume leadership role. Secondary school principals' distributive leadership practices while exercising the five core leadership function in school setting were low and unsatisfactory. Principals do not involve teachers while developing vision, mission goals and values of the school system. Thus, principals lose potential support from teachers that could have contributed for quality education and students' academic achievement. It was found out that spending much time on administrative issues rather than academic issues, lack of knowledge on how-to participate teachers in leading schools, lack of knowledge on what kind's tasks to be distributed to teachers so that teachers play leadership role were among the major factors that hinder principals practice of distributive leadership.

The mean score of the teachers on the all independent variables of mean and standard deviations are statistically significantly than those of schools leaders on the same variables. t-test was computed to look for any statistically significant difference for each of the independent variables between the two groups of respondents there is statistically significant difference between the means of the two groups, i.e. the teachers do not share the same perception as the school leaders implementation of the distributive leadership practices guided and supported and typically the

teachers are more generous than the school leaders. The school leaders and the teachers perceive distributive leadership hindering factors from different angle, it possible to infer from their responses that there are gaps in exercising, distributive leadership in school setting in secondary schools under study.

### **5.3. Recommendations**

In light of the findings of the study and conclusion, the following would serve as recommendations:

- It is known that, the challenge now for school is to adopt the inclusive leadership practice approach so as to enhance and foster sustainable leadership success. Thus, it is recommended that, playing leadership role should not be tied to principals' position, but should be distributed among teachers. Generally in order to utilize teachers' unused potential in school leadership area and achieve benefit of distributed leadership, it is necessary to view teachers as partners in educational leadership process by stretching leadership roles across all teachers.
  - The collaborative nature of interdisciplinary teams, as well as the trust and relationships necessary to engage in effective teaming also seem to be factors in the success of these schools' distributed leadership practices.
  - It is better all school members should collectively develop the vision, mission goals and values of the school.
  - Principals make more on empower, capacitate, create opportunity for all teachers so that teachers fully involved in school leadership.
  - Principals establish strong team work and group decision making should be stimulated and encouraged in schools so that all teachers can participate in running of the schools' affairs.
- Finally, the researcher believes that this study could be taken as good start in the area of reorganizing and restructuring educational institutions in general and schools in particular in terms of distributive leadership practices.

### References

- Allen, L. (2004) From Votes to Dialogues: *clarifying the role of teachers' voices in school renewal* Phi Delta Kappan, 49(10),20-25.
- Ag, P. L., Allen, A. S., Topolka-jorissen, K., Lang, P., Allen, A. S., & Topolka-jorissen, K. (2016). *How Principals Develop and Support Teach*, 408(25),31-35.
- Bass,B.M., & Bass,R.(2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory,Research Managerial Applications.4th Edition*. New York: Free Press.
- Barker, R. (2001).The nature of leadership.Human Relations. New Delhi India
- Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P.A. and Harvey, J.A. (2003).Distributed Leadership. Nottingham: National College of School Leadership.
- Benson, A. M., & Blackman, D. (2011). To distribute leadership or not? A lesson from the islands. *Tourism Management*, 32(5), 1141–1149. Retrieved January 15,2017 from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2010.10.002>
- Belhiah, H. (2007) Toward a New Conceptualization of Teacher Leadership in Moroccan Schools, Proceedings of the Mate 27th Annual National Conference. Al Akhawayn University in Ifrane.
- Bennett, N., Wise, C., Woods, P., & Harvey, J. (2003).Distributed Leadership (Full report).National College for School Leadership, Oxford, UK.
- Bennis,W.(1990). *Why Leaders can't Lead?* San Fransisco: Josey.Bass.
- Beare, H., Caldwell, B., & Millikan, R. (1989). *Creating an Excellent School*. London: Routledge
- Blasé, J. (2004) *Handbook of Instructional Leadership: How successful principals promote teaching and learning*. Thousand Oaks CA: Corwin Press.
- Blegen,M.B.&Kenedy,C.(2000). Principals and teachers leading together.*National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 84 (616),1-6

- Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. leaders
- Bolman, L.G., Crow, G.M., Goldring, E., Slater, R.O., & Thurston, P.W. (1994). Taxonomy and overview. In W.K.Hoy (Ed.), *Educational administration: The UCEA document base USA*: McGraw Hill USA printing press.
- Brewer, D. (1993). Principals and student outcomes: *Evidence from U.S. highschools. Economics of Education Review, 12*,(24)281-292.
- Brungardt,C.(1998). “*The New face of Leadership: Implications for Highereducation. Leadership Studies*”.Fort hays State University, An internet document retrieved on February 4,2017 from [http//www.nwlink.com](http://www.nwlink.com).
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2003). Trust in schools: A core resource for school reform. *Educational Leadership, 60*(6), 40-44.
- Caldwell, B.J. and Spinks,J.M.(1988). *The Self Managing School*.London: Falmer press. California: Crown Press, Inc.
- Cambell, J.P. (1997). The cutting Edge of Leadership. An overview in J.G. Hunt and L.L.larson (eds). *Leadership: The cutting edge*. Carbondal, I.L: southern Illinois University press.
- Camburn, E., Rowan, B., & Taylor, J. (2003).Distributed leadership in schools: The case of the elementary schools adopting comprehensive school reform models. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 25*, (50):347–373.
- Chen,Y.(2007) Principals Distributed LeadershipBehaviors: An exploratorystudy, unpublished doctoral dissertation. Texas A&M University.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1994). Principal's leadership as a critical factor for school performance: Evidence from multilevel of primary schools. *SchoolEffectiveness and School Improvement, 5*,(14) 299-317.
- Ciulla,Joanne B.(ed.) (2004). *Ethics and Leadership effectiveness*. New York: Sage publications.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1980). *Research Methods in Education* (4th ed). London: Groom Helm Ltd.

Creswell, J. W. (2011). *Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Educational research* 4<sup>th</sup> edition. London: Sage.

Danielson, C. (2006). *Teacher Leadership that Strengthens Professional Practice*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (ASCD) Alexandria, Virginia U.S.A.

Daresh, J. C. and et al (2002). *What it Means to be a Principal: Your Guide to Leadership*. California: Corwin Press Inc.

Day, C. et al. (2007). *The Impact of School Leadership on Pupil Outcomes: Interim Report*. Nottingham: National College for School Leadership for Department for Children, Schools and Families.

Dejene L. (2014). *Challenges of distributive leadership practices in Addis ababa university*. Addis ababa Ethiopia.

Dimmock, C. (1999). Principals and school restructuring: conceptualizing challenges as dilemmas, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 37 (5), 441-462.

Duressa, Z., & Author, C. (2014). Leadership Effectiveness in Public Service Organizations of Ethiopia: Perceptions of Leaders in Public Service Organizations, 26(2), 115–130.

DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). *Professional learning communities at work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Services.

Duigan, P.A and Macpherson, R.I. (1993). *Educative Leadership: A practical Theory*. *Educational administration Quarterly*, 29 (1), 8-33

Edmonds, R. (1979). *Effective schools for the urban poor*. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24. Effectiveness. University of Tasmania. <http://www.oecd.org/>

Elmore, R. F. (1999). *When accountability knocks, will anyone answer?* Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

- Elmore, R. (2000). *Building a new structure for school leadership*. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Emery, C.R., & Barker, K.J. (2007). The effect of transformational and transactional leadership styles on the organizational commitment and Job satisfaction of Customer Contact Personnel. *Journal of organizational culture, communication and conflict*, 11(1):77.
- Fiedler, F.E. (1964). *A contingency model of leadership effectiveness*. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fink, D., & Brayman, C. (2006). School leadership succession and the challenges of change. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 62- 89.
- Firestone, W. A. (1989). Using reform: Conceptualizing district initiative. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11(2), 151-165.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Frost, D., and Durrant, J. (2003) *Teacher-led Development Work: Guidance and support*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Firestone, W. A. & Diamond, L. (2001). Leadership roles or function *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3), 251–269. Retrieved January 25, 2017 from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2011.00306>.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change*. (3rd ed.). Columbia University, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (2001). *Leading in a Culture of Change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (1995). The school as learning organization: Distant dreams theory in practice .
- Gibb, C. A. (1954). Leadership. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 877-917). Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gibson, J.L et al. (2003). *Organizations: Behavior, Structure and Process*. New York: McGraw.Hill/Irwin.

- Given, R.J. (2008). Transformational leadership: The Impact of Organizational and Personal Outcomes. *Emerging leadership Journeys*, 1(1), 4-5.
- Glasman, L., & Glasman, N. (1997). Connecting the preparation of school leaders to the practice of school leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 3-20.
- Glover, D and Lae, S. (2000). *Educational leadership and learning*. London: Open University press.
- Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2001). *Supervision and instructional leadership: A developmental approach*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Goleman, D. (2002). *The New Leaders: Transforming the art of leadership into the science of results*. London: Little Brown.
- Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational management and Administration*, 28(3), 317-338.
- Gronn, P. (2002). Distributed leadership. *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. K. Leithwood and P. Hallinger. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Gronn, P. (2003). *The new work of educational leaders*. London: Paul Chapman Press.
- Guthrie, R. W., & Reed, R. J. (1991). *Educational administration and policy: Effective leadership for American education* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (2001). *Implementing change: Patterns, principles, and potholes*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hallinger, P., and Heck, R.H. (1998). *Exploring the Principals Contribution to School Effectiveness. School Leadership & Management* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw.Hill.
- Harris, A. (2002). Effective leadership in schools facing challenging contexts. *School Leadership & Management*, 22 (1), 15-26.

- Hoyle, E. and Wallace, M. (2005) *Educational Leadership: ambiguity, professionals and managerialism*. London, Sage Publication.
- Hoyle, J.R. (1992). Ten Commandments for successful site-based management. National Association of Secondary principal Bulletin.
- Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 32(1), 11-24.
- Harris, A. (2005). Leading or misleading? Distributed leadership and school improvement. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(3), 255-265.
- Harris, A., & Muijs, D. (2005). *Improving schools through teacher leadership*. UK: Open University Press
- Harris, A. (2005). *Distributed leadership*. The essentials of school leadership London: palmerchapman.
- Harris, A. (2008). *Distributed leadership: developing tomorrow's leaders*. London: Routledge.
- Hopkins, D. (2001). *School improvement for real*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2005). *A Call to Action: Transforming High School for All Youth*. National High School Alliance, Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, DC
- Jones, G.R and George, J.M (2006) *Contemporary Management (4th ed)*. Boston: McGrawHill.
- Karmel, B. (1978). Leadership Challenge to Traditional Research Methods and assumptions. *Academy of Management Review*, 3, (90)475-482.
- Katzenmeyer, M. & Moller, G. (1996). *Awakening the sleeping Giant: Leadership Development for Teachers*. Thousand Oaks, California: Crown Press, Inc.
- Katzenmeyer, M., & Moller, G. (2001). *Awakening the sleeping giant: Helping teachers develop as leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Kerry, T. and Murdoch, A. (1993). "Education Managers as Leaders: some thoughts on the

conflict of the changing nature of schools”. *Journal of School Organization*, volume13, number3, pp.221-230)

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1993). *Credibility: how leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership practices inventory: Theory and evidence behind the five practices of exemplary leaders*. Retrieved December 16, 2016 from, [http://media.wiley.com/assets/61/06/lc\\_jb\\_appendix.pdf](http://media.wiley.com/assets/61/06/lc_jb_appendix.pdf)

Krishnan, V.R.2005. Transformational Leadership and Outcomes: role of Leadership duration. *Leadership and organizational culture*,26 (6):442-457

Larson,J.(2009). Transformational Leadership.Leadng schools in a time of Global cultural shifts. *Independent school*, 68(3):51-58

Lambert, L. (1998).*Building leadership capacity in schools*. Alexandria, VA:ssociation for Supervision and Curriculum Development Alexandria free press.

Leiberman, A., and Miller, L. (2004).*Teacher leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for School Restructuring.*EducationalAdministration Quarterly*, 30(4), 498-518.

Leithwood, K. (2004). Educational Leadership. A review of the research. *The Laboratory for Student Success*, 36. Retrieved March 10,2017 from <http://www.temple.edu/lss/pdf/ReviewOfTheResearchLeithwood.pdf>

Leithwood, K.A. and Riehl, C. (2003). *What We Know About Successful School Leadership*. Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.

Leithwood, K. A., & Stager, M. (1989).Expertise in principals' problem solving.*Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25(2), 126-151.

Leithwood, K., &Jantzi, D. (2000).The effects of transformational leadership on organizational

conditions and student engagement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 112

Leithwood, K.A and Riehl, C. (2003). "What We Know About Successful School Leadership".

Philadelphia, Unpublished research paper on educational leadership, Temple University  
accessed March 28, 2017 from [www.lepa.gse.rutgers.edu/whatweknow.pdf](http://www.lepa.gse.rutgers.edu/whatweknow.pdf).

Leithwood, K., Mascal, B., Strauss, T., Sacks, R., Memon, N., & Yashkina, A. (2006).  
Distributing leadership to make schools smarter: Taking the ego out of the system.  
*Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6(1), 37-67

Leithwood, K., Mascal, B. & Strauss, T. (Eds.) (2009). *Distributed Leadership According to the  
Evidence*. New York: Routledge.

Lshaway, L. (2003). "Role of the school leader". Clearing House on Educational polices and  
Management, College of Education, University of Oregon. Available at [www.eric.uregon](http://www.eric.uregon).

Lunenburg, F., & Ornstein, A. (2004). *Educational administration: Concepts and practice (4th  
ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Thompson Learning Inc

MacBeath, J. (2005) "Leadership as Distributed: a matter of practice," *School Leadership and  
Management*, 25 (4) pp 349-366.

MacEwan, E.K. (2001). *7 Steps to Effective Educational Leadership. (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks  
Manning, G., & Curtis, K. 2002. *The art of leadership*. New York: McGraw Hill

MoE (1994). *The New Education and Training Policy*. Addis Ababa: EMPDA

MoE (2005). *The Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia Education Sector Development  
Program III (ESDP-III). Program Action Plan*. Addis Ababa: Berhanenaselam Printing

Mehra, A., Smith, B., Dixon, A., & Robertson, B. (2006). *Distributed Leadership in teams: The  
network of leadership perceptions and team performance. The Leadership  
Quarterly*, 17:232-245

Mujis, D. (2005). *Empowering schools through Leadership*. New York: open University Press.

Mulford, B. (2003). *School Leaders: Changing Roles and Impact on Teachers and School*  
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Murphay, J. (2005). *Connecting Teacher Leadership and School Improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2006). *Breaking ranks in the middle: Strategies for leading middle level reform*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Northouse, P. G. (2009). *Leadership: Theory and Practice. 5th Edition*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publishing, Inc.
- Oduro, G. K. T. (2004). Distributed leadership in schools: what English head teachers say about the "pull" and "push" factors. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Manchester, 16–18 September.
- Sergiovanni, T. (2001). *Leadership: what's in it for schools?* London. Routledge.
- Silins, H. and Mulford, W. (2002). Leadership and school results. In Leithwood, K. and Hallinger, P. (eds), *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 561–612.
- Smylie, M. A., & Denny, J. W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(3), 235-259.
- Storey, A. (2004). "The problem of distributed leadership in schools". *School Leadership and Management*, 24(3): 249-265
- Stoll, L. (2004) "Enhancing internal capacity: leadership for learning" <http://www.ncsl.org.uk>.
- Tead, O. (1935). *The art of leadership*. New York: McGraw Hill New York.
- Taylor, P. (2004). Leadership in education. *Emergency Librarian*, 21(3), 9. Retrieved December 16, 2016, from Academic Search Elite database.
- Trottier, T., and et al. (2008). Examining the nature and significance of leadership in government organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 68(2), 319-333. New Delhi India.
- Palmer, R. E. (2008). *Ultimate Leadership*. New Jersey: Pearson Education
- Pont, B., Nusche, D. & Moorman, H. (2008). *Improving School Leadership Volume 1: Policy*

*and Practice*, Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

Woods, P.A. (2004) Democratic leadership: drawing distinctions with distributed leadership, International Journal of Leadership in Education.USA.